

Appl. No. 10/781,613
Atty. Docket No. CM2603CQ
Amdt. dated April 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 27, 2006
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1 - 12 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Rejection Under 35 USC §112, First Paragraph

The Office asserts that the reply filed on January 23, 2006 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action. Specifically, the Office asserts that the response does not address the § 112, first paragraph rejection presented in the Office Action dated March 11, 2005.

The rejection presented in the March 11, 2005 Office Action specifically pointed to language in the specification which appeared to be contradictory to the data presented in Table I. The specific portion of the specification referred to was on page 15, lines 1-11 which states:

In prior art nonwoven loop fasteners, higher nonwoven integrity was achieved by adding bond lines, while attempting to balance the needs of web integrity with the need to have a certain minimum number of fibers available for hook engagement. However, the increase in linear bond lines simply results in a directly proportional increase in contour. That is, in prior art linear bond patterns an increase in bond area was gained by a directly proportional gain in the number of anchored fibers. But since the overall bond area increased, such an increase in linear bond lines simply resulted in a directly proportional loss in total fibers available for engaging. This technical contradiction has been solved by the pattern of the present invention. Specifically, by the pattern of the present invention, the number of fibers anchored can be increased by increasing the contour, while not directly proportionally increasing overall bond area that reduces the number of fibers available for engaging hook members.

(Specification page 15, lines 1-11).

In accordance with a telephone conversation with Examiner Jack W. Lavinder, dated April 17, 2006, Applicants respectfully submit the following clarification. The pattern of the present invention does not increase the overall bonded area to the same

Appl. No. 10/781,613
Att. Docket No. CM2603CQ
Amdt. dated April 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 27, 2006
Customer No. 27752

extent as the straight line pattern of the prior art. For example, for a given bonded area of 22.5% Table I shows that the contour is 73.53 mm/cm². In contrast, as an example of a conventional straight line pattern, a bonded area of 22.5% would yield a contour of 72.48 mm/cm². Thus, for a given bonded area, the amount of contour in the present invention would be greater than the contour of a conventional straight bond line pattern.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By


Signature

George H. Leal

Typed or Printed Name

Registration No. 56,813

(513) 634-1597

Date: April 19, 2006
Customer No. 27752